

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

The drawings have been objected to by the Examiner for failing to comply with 37 CFR §1.84(p)(5), because reference numbers 34 and 36 of FIG. 1 do not appear in the Specification. Page 7 of the Specification has been amended to include reference number 34 and 36.

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure because of certain informalities. Pages 1 and 8 of the Specification have been amended to correct the informalities.

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC §112 for being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to overcome the 35 USC §112 rejection.


Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected by the Examiner under the judicially created doctrine of double-patenting over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,621,591. A Terminal Disclaimer is being filed herewith to overcome this rejection.

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC §101, because the invention as claimed is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to claim statutory subject matter, i.e., they are in the computer technological art and use an envelope printer to print an IBIP indicia and an address on a mail piece.

In view of the above, claims 1 and 2, as amended, are patentable. If the Examiner has any questions, the resolution of which he believes will be advanced by a telephone conversation with Applicants' attorney, would he please call the undersigned at the telephone number noted below.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald Reichman

Reg. No. 26,796

Attorney of Record

Telephone (203) 924-3854

Appln. No.: 09/747,150
Amdt. Dated April 5, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated February 4, 2005

PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and
Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive
P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484-8000